

Remarks

Claims 1-5 and 7-11 are pending.

Claim Objections

The Examiner suggests that the article "a" or "an" should be changed to "the" in several instances in Claims 2, 3 and 5. In each instance, however, a step from the parent claim is being recited verbatim in the dependent claim and the step thereafter further defined. Hence, the step itself is introduced by "the" (rather than "a") but each limitation in the step is, quite appropriately, recited in its original form. The objections should be withdrawn.

Claim Rejections

Claims 1-5 and 7-11 were rejected under Section 102 and 103 as being anticipated by, or obvious over, Mantell (6189993). The rejections are all based on the assertion that Mantell teaches a printer controller automatically selecting a print media in based on the selection of a print quality mode. This assertion is not correct.

Mantell teaches a printer driver 84 recommending a print media by highlighting the recommended media in a selection menu. Mantell explicitly teaches that the user, not the printer driver, makes the selection. "Upon selection of one of the print quality modes **and one of the media types**, the user would, if satisfied with the selections, would [sic] select the OK selector 112 to begin printing." Mantell column 7, lines 60-63 (emphasis added). Mantell actually teaches away from the printer controller 21 (or even printer driver 84) automatically selecting the print media. It is clear not only that the user makes the selection but that she is free to disregard the highlighted recommendation. Hence, Mantell does not teach a printer controller (or even a printer driver) automatically selecting a print media in based on the selection of a print quality mode.

The claims distinguish patentably over Mantell and the rejections should be withdrawn.

The foregoing is believed to be a complete response to the pending Office Action.

Respectfully submitted,
/Steven R. Ormiston/

Steven R. Ormiston
Attorney For Applicant
Reg. No. 35,974
208.433.1991 x204